instruction and non-interactive instruction. The ability to view all of the outputs of a step, whether manual or automatic, is a user friendly feature and very advantageous as it eliminates a need for the operator to switch among several views to achieve interactive control.

Independent apparatus claim 4 captures the display interface by reciting:

"a user interface component that provides at least a table view, said table view comprising a plurality of outputs of a selected step of at least one of said sequential control modules, wherein said outputs comprise a combination of at least one non-interactive instruction and at least one interactive instruction".

Independent method claim 14 captures the display interface by reciting:

"presenting an interactive display screen to an operator that displays a plurality of outputs of a selected step of at least one of said sequential control modules, wherein said outputs comprise a combination of at least one automatic expression and at least one interactive instruction".

In contrast, Lipner discloses an executive interface 39 (Fig. 2) and a procedure interface 47 (Fig. 3), neither of which displays the outputs of a selected step of the procedure in which the outputs are a combination of an interactive instruction and a non-interactive instruction (independent claim 4) or of an interactive instruction and an automatic expression (independent claim 14).

Lipner provides a procedure view for a procedure that is in manual mode as shown in Fig. 3 and a separate procedure view for a procedure that is in automatic mode (not shown in any drawing figure). In the manual procedure view of Fig. 3, there is no disclosure of any automatic expression. Lipner makes no mention of a procedure or step of a procedure that has a combination of

2

interactive instruction and automatic expression. Thus, Lipner teaches a system that handles either a procedure that is manual or a procedure that is automatic, but not a procedure that is both automatic and manual.

The Examiner contends (paragraph 17 of the Office Action) that when a state of an automatic procedure is violated, an interactive instruction will occur, citing column 2, lines 27-35 and column 4, lines 19-22. Apparently, the Examiner is reading the above noted portions of claims 4 and 14 on a display view of procedure that is in automatic mode. However, Lipner does not have any drawing figure that shows such a view.

In the column 2, lines 27-35, citation, Lipner teaches that if a control signal generated by a step does not result in an expected modification of process conditions, "the step is violated and the automatic sequencing will terminate requiring operator intervention". The column 2, lines 27-35, citation indicates that the automatic mode then reverts to a "violated mode" that requires operator action. However, there is no description of the "violated mode" or of how the operator action is implemented. Lipner's operation of reversion to a "violated mode" does not anticipate the plain language of the above quoted recitals of independent claims 4 and 14. Lipner does not teach a display screen that displays "a plurality of outputs of a selected step" for any of the manual, automatic and violated modes. In fact, Lipner does not disclose or teach any particular display screen that displays operator selection of a step of a procedure for display on the display screen. The violated state of an automatic procedure is not "selected". The "violated state" happens as a result of a failure of a control signal to cause expected modifications of process conditions. Therefore, the "violated state" is not selected. Accordingly, Lipner lacks the above noted recitals of independent claims 4 and 14.

With respect to independent claim 4, Lipner's system does not display a view of a procedure that has both an interactive instruction and a non-interactive

3

instruction and, therefore, does not teach a "controller" that executes "said non-interactive instruction automatically". Therefore, Lipner also lacks the controller recited in independent claim 4.

With respect to independent claim 14, Lipner also lacks the "determining" step. Lipner has either a procedure that is executed automatically (all outputs are automatic) or a procedure that is executed interactively (all outputs are interactive). Therefore, Lipner has no need to determine whether a current one of the outputs is an interactive instruction or an automatic expression. Therefore, Lipner also lacks the "determining" step recited in independent claim 14.

Further with respect to independent claim 14, since Lipner lacks the "determining" step, Lipner also lacks the "if said current output" steps, which are conditional on the determination made by the "determining" step. Therefore, Lipner also lacks the "if said current output" steps recited in independent claim 14.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 2-7 and 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Lipner is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Lipner in view of U.S Patent No. 6,775,576 to Spriggs, hereafter Spriggs.

This rejection is erroneous claim 8 depends on independent claim 4 via intervening claim 6. That is, Lipner lacks elements recited in independent claim 4 as set forth in the discussion of claim 4. These elements are not disclosed or taught by Spriggs, which was cited for a different reason.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

4

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn, that claims 2-14 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that this amendment places the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and passed to issue. If this amendment is deemed to not place the application in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that it be entered for the purpose of appeal.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date:_____7|17_____, 2006

Paul D. Greeley
Reg. No. 31,019
Attorney for Applicant
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
(203) 327-4500

5